

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,759	01/09/2001	Ramakrishnan Srikant	ARC920010024US1	8061

7590 07/14/2004
Samuel A. Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER

HOLMES, MICHAEL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/757,759

Applicant(s)

SRIKANT ET AL.

Examiner

Michael B. Holmes

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - www.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This office action is responsive to application **09/757,759**, filed **January 09, 2001**.
2. **Claims 1-26** have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dugan et al.* (USPN 6,425,005) in view of *Szabo* (USPN 5,966,126).

Regarding claim 1: *Dugan et al.* describes a method for optimizing a hierarchical organization of a network site (*Dugan et al.* C 6, L 17-21) comprising: analyzing user access patterns to automatically locate weak spots in the hierarchical organization, where user's expected locations do not coincide with actual locations. *Dugan et al.* does not describe this feature i.e., analyzing

Art Unit: 2121

user access patterns to automatically locate weak spots in the hierarchical organization, where user's expected locations do not coincide with actual locations. However, *Szabo* teaches this feature analyzing user access patterns to automatically locate weak spots in the hierarchical organization, where user's expected locations do not coincide with actual locations. (*Szabo* C 7, L 43-51) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Dugan et al.* with *Szabo* for the purpose determining the "correct" results of a web search. (*Szabo* C 7, L 51-55)

Regarding claim 14: *Dugan et al.* describes a computer program product (C 7, L 54-59) for optimizing a hierarchical organization of a network site (*Dugan et al.* C 6, L 11-16), comprising: an analysis module for analyzing user access patterns to automatically locate weak spots in the hierarchical organization, where user's expected locations do not coincide with actual locations. *Dugan et al.* does not describe this feature i.e., an analysis module for analyzing user access patterns to automatically locate weak spots in the hierarchical organization, where user's expected locations do not coincide with actual locations. However, *Szabo* teaches this feature an analysis module for analyzing user access patterns to automatically locate weak spots in the hierarchical organization (C 17, L 15-25) where user's expected locations do not coincide with actual locations. (*Szabo* C 7, L 43-51) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Dugan et al.* with *Szabo* for the purpose determining the "correct" results of a web search. (*Szabo* C 7, L 51-55)

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 2 & 15: further including determining available corrective measures to compensate for the weak spots (*Szabo* C 7, L 51-54; C 8, L 38-47); and assessing the corrective measures. (*Szabo* C 7, L 20-22).

Regarding claim 3 & 16: further including in response to the assessing step, selectively implementing the corrective measures. (*Szabo* C7, L 22-30)

Regarding claim 4& 17: further including in response to the assessing step or assessment module for assessing the corrective measures (*Szabo* C 17, L 33-40), presenting the corrective measures to an administrator for review. (*Dugan et al.* FIG. 5, item 500)

Regarding claim 5 & 18: wherein the analyzing step includes determining backtracks to identify the expected locations. (*Szabo* C 16, L 66 item b.– C 17, L 03)

Regarding claim 6 & 19: for optimizing the hierarchical organization (*Dugan et al.* C 6, L 11-16) of a Web site (*Szabo* C7, L 22-30), wherein the analyzing step includes determining backtracks to identify the expected Web pages. (*Szabo* C 16, L 66 item b.– C 17, L 03)

Regarding claim 7 & 20: wherein the analyzing step further includes inferring backtracks if at least some Web pages have been cached. (*Szabo* C 16, L 33-40; Official Notice is taken with respect to cache as being are old and well known)

Art Unit: 2121

5. Claims 8-12, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dugan et al.* (USPN 6,425,005) in view of *Szabo* (USPN 5,966,126) in further view of *Pirolli et al.* (USPN 5,835,905).

Regarding claim 8 & 21: *Dugan et al.* does not disclose the limitation adding at least one link from an expected location to a target page. However, *Pirolli et al.* teaches the limitation adding at least one link from an expected location to a target page. (*Pirolli et al.* C 3, L 58-61) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the references for the purpose of allowing users of large linked collections of data and or documents, for instance as manifest on the World Wide Web, the ability to access a wide range of information over the Internet easily.

Regarding claim 9 & 22: wherein the assessing step includes evaluating a frequency with which visitors expect to find a web page at an expected location. (*Pirolli et al.* C 8, L 01-06) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the references for the purpose of analyzing a collections of documents residing on the portion of the Internet known as the World Wide Web, to the determine the predicted or expected number of hits a page will receive.

Regarding claim 10 & 23: wherein the assessing step includes evaluating a benefit of adding a link between the expected location and the target page. (*Szabo* C 17, L 48-59; Note: Web surfing would be a considered a benefit. Moreover, web surfing is considered well known to persons of ordinary skill in the art.)

Regarding claim 11 & 24: wherein the implementing step includes proposing that a new link be added between the expected location and the target page. (*Pirolli et al.* C 3, L 58-61) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the references for the purpose of allowing users of large linked collections of data and or documents, for instance as manifest on the World Wide Web, the ability to access a wide range of information over the Internet easily.

Regarding claim 12 & 25: wherein the implementing step includes automatically adding a link between the expected location and the target page. (*Pirolli et al.* C 3, L 58-61) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the references for the purpose of allowing users of large linked collections of data and or documents, for instance as manifest on the World Wide Web, the ability to access a wide range of information over the Internet easily.

6. Claims 13 & 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dugan et al.* (USPN 6,425,005) in view of *Szabo* (USPN 5,966,126) in further view of *Pirolli et al.* (USPN 5,835,905) in further view of *Lin et al.* (USPAP 2001/0034637).

Regarding claim 13 & 26: *Dugan et al.* does not disclose the limitation importing a plurality of updated weblogs for a Web page; and analyzing the hierarchical organization in light of the weblogs. However, *Lin et al.* teaches the limitation importing a plurality of updated weblogs for a Web page; and analyzing the hierarchical organization in light of the weblogs. (*Lin et al.*

Art Unit: 2121

[0032]) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the references for the purpose of recording traffic to each space compiled each day and provided by the various web servers in the network.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and (listed of form **PTO-892**) not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant or applicant's representative is respectfully reminded that in process of patent prosecution i.e., amending of claims in response to a rejection of claims set forth by the Examiner per Title 35 U.S.C. The patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and any objections made. Moreover, applicant or applicant's representative must clearly show how the amendments avoid or overcome such references and objections. *See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).*

Correspondence Information

8. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 308-6280**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding After Final issues, please send it to **(703) 746-7238**. If you need to send an Official facsimile trans-

Art Unit: 2121

mission, please send it to (703) 746-7239. If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft) facsimile transmission the fax is (703) 746-7240. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (703) 308-3179.

Any response to this office action should be mailed too:

Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231. Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of **Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia.**

Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600